

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE CONGRESS-  
MAN, GARRY BROWN, 1923-1998

## HON. FRED UPTON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 20, 1998

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, many of you may not have heard of the passing a few weeks ago of our former colleague, Congressman Garry Brown, who represented southwest Michigan. Through more than a decade of service in the House of Representatives, Garry Brown will be remembered as an ambassador from a more genteel era of politics.

Brown served six terms in the U.S. House of Representatives, from 1966 to 1978, where he was known for his hard work and solid command of the issues. Brown's personal foundation was rooted in his high ethical standards. His belief that Members could remain close friends while disagreeing over the issues helped carry him through some of the most difficult times in our Nation's history.

His service to his Nation was not limited to the House. Preceding his congressional career, Brown was a brave member of our armed services during the Second World War in Japan. After the war, he worked for the FBI before he came home to Schoolcraft, MI, to enter State politics. A delegate to the Michigan Constitutional Convention, he played a major role in crafting the present State constitution.

Later in life, Garry Brown returned to his farm in Schoolcraft, MI, where he spoke of the pride and joy he gained in his role as an elder statesman. He will be remembered as the gentleman from Michigan in every sense of the word. He led his life with dignity, served his community with respect, and lived with a profound love for his country.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in sending my condolences to his daughter, Ms. Frances Brown, and to all of Gerry's family and friends. Congressman Garry Eldridge Brown will be sorely missed by us all.

ATTEMPTS TO BLACKLIST PEOPLE  
BECAUSE OF DEMOCRATIC  
PARTY AFFILIATION

## HON. RON KLINK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 20, 1998

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when people were blacklisted from jobs because of alleged affiliation with the Communist Party. Today, attempts are being made to blacklist people because of their affiliation with the Democratic Party.

How do they do that in our democratic system? Through direct threats to employers' pocketbooks. According to Roll Call, the Washington Post, and the New York Times, Speaker GINGRICH, Majority Leader RICHARD ARMEY, Majority Whip TOM DELAY and House

Republican Chairman JOHN BOEHNER either themselves called or instructed others to call member companies of the Electronics Alliance Industry (EIA) and demand that EIA break its contract with former Democratic Congressman Dave McCurdy and hire a Republican as its new president. In case that was not sufficient warning, the Republican leadership then removed legislation to implement the World Intellectual Property Organization Act from the floor schedule and told EIA it was to "send a message" that McCurdy and other Democrats were not welcome in Republican leadership offices. EIA stood up to the pressure, but some member companies now are talking about leaving the association to set up a more Republican-acceptable one.

This is not new. Since 1995, Representative DELAY has been threatening trade associations, law firms and lobbying groups to remove Democrats from top jobs and replace them with Republicans. To see him, Representative DELAY told one company, "you have to hire a Republican." As Representative BILL PAXON said, Democrats are "the enemy" and should not be supported. ["Speaker and His Directors Make the Cash Flow Right," Washington Post, Nov. 27, 1995.] Apparently, the Republican leadership no longer believe in a robust two-party system.

In many countries in the world, the actions of the Republican majority would be routine behavior. Persons affiliated with the ruling dictator or party and its henchmen get good private and public jobs for themselves and their families; special deals when public businesses are "privatized"; and many other luxuries. Several billionaires were made in Mexico over the past decade because of such affiliations with the ruling party—the PRI. Dissidents in the former Soviet Union and its satellite states were denied the right to work at their chosen professions because of their political views. In the Congo, the right to work at all under former dictator Mobutu often depended on political party affiliation. The right to work and speak in China today can depend upon a person's political views. Indonesia, Malaysia . . . I could go on and on.

From our vaunted and privileged perch in what is still the world's greatest democracy, we call these countries and their leaders "corrupt," "backward," and "undemocratic." We decry the "inefficiencies" that result from such interferences with individual and corporate freedoms. We spend millions of dollars every year to bring the message of our "democracy" to the benighted of the world. But unfortunately, in the Congress of the United States, the majority party too is now imposing the litmus test of party affiliation to reward or punish our citizens. The Republicans are using party affiliation to determine who has the right to petition the government. The sacred constitutional rights of free speech and association and the right to freely contract for goods and services no longer exist if you are registered as a Democrat. In fact, you may be summoned before a Congressional Committee to explain all of your business dealings. This new

1990's McCarthyism is a way of life for the Republican party. Light must be shed on it and it must be stopped.

Let me provide another example about how this Congress is punishing people for being Democrats or having the audacity to hire Democrats to work for them. Last week Chairman JOE BARTON of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee of the Commerce Committee, came to the floor to announce that he intended to refer to the Justice Department for further "investigation" his allegations that certain highly connected Democrats and Democratic supporters had lied under oath at subcommittee hearings, paid illegal contingency fees for government leases and conspired to commit all manner of mayhem in violation of the federal conspiracy statute.

Chairman BARTON also demanded that the General Services Administration "take immediate steps"—apparently without going through proper legal channels and by breaching a valid contract—to get back all the rent it has paid for the Portalls II building, the new headquarters into which the Federal Communications Commission will begin moving next week. Chairman BARTON also wants the GSA to recover all fees paid to Washington lawyers by one of the partners in that development. Exactly how this is to be done legally is quite unclear, particularly since on October 7, 1998, GSA issued a "lease status" letter indicating that the government was not aware of any "defense to its obligations under the Lease." The chairman did not further enlighten us.

The special order appeared to be a last-minute, cheap shot bid for press attention—and speech-and-debate protection—for old, unproven allegations and an investigation that has drilled a dry hole. There is no report nor is a referral letter yet written. One must question why a subcommittee chairman needs to go to the floor to give instructions to his staff.

More importantly, this referral is not based on credible evidence but is an attempt to punish private persons who happen to be Democrats by forcing them to go through months of additional investigations when the Subcommittee's own work failed to uncover any criminal wrongdoing. Attorneys' fees to defend against a continuing string of unsuccessful investigations can be used quite easily to cripple individuals with different political views. As much was threatened at the Subcommittee's October 6, 1998, hearing. In his opening statement, Committee Chairman BLILEY told the witnesses that he believed that their behavior was "wrong," and that "if they continue down the path of evasion and avoidance, they should know the consequences will be far greater." (emphasis added)

Chairman BLILEY stated that the witnesses' previous testimony, in which they denied any wrongdoing, raised "serious questions about whether these men intended to mislead the Committee." He claimed the Subcommittee had "other testimony and evidence" that should cast "significant doubt" on their explanations. But, as staff and members already knew, there was no new testimony or evidence to be presented at that hearing or the

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.